

University Senate
March 19, 2007

The University Senate met at 3 pm on Monday, March 19, 2007 in the Auditorium of the W. T. Young Library. Below is a record of what transpired. All votes were taken via a show of hands unless indicated otherwise.

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 pm.

1. Minutes and Announcements

The Chair said that there were no changes to the minutes from the special meeting on January 29, but there was a quote attributed to “[Unknown].” He said that if anyone knew who the unknown person was, it would be corrected. There being no changes to the minutes from the special meeting on January 29, they were approved as distributed.

The Chair referred senators to the minutes from February 12. He agreed to incorporate Sheahan’s request to be marked as “excused.” There being no further comments, the minutes from February 12 were approved as amended.

With regard to the April Senate meeting, the Chair said that he had invited Provost Subbaswamy to offer some closing remarks at the last meeting of the semester. The Chair added that there would be a reception afterwards during which senators could chat with the Provost.

The Chair brought senators’ attention to a letter sent to legislators and the governor regarding UK-related legislation in Frankfort. He said he wanted to inform senators of the communication. There were no comments or questions.

The Chair then reported on two rule waivers for students. The Senate Council (SC) waived *Senate Rule* (SR) 5.1.8.5.A.2 for two students who submitted their retroactive withdrawal application to either their dean or the Office of the Senate Council within the “two-year window,” but their cases were not able to be reviewed by the Senate’s Retroactive Withdrawal Application Committee because the review would have occurred outside the two-year window. The Chair said that senators would see an agenda item later in the meeting that was proposed to address the constant need for the SC to waive *SR 5.1.8.5.A.2* for various students.

Moving on to the next item, the Chair said he assumed senators were familiar with the recent change to the posting policy for Board of Trustees (BoT) meeting agendas. Previously, agendas were posted four days in advance of a meeting, on the Friday before. The change shortened the advance posting time to just four hours – agendas would now be posted by 9 am of the meeting day. He referred senators to the text of the email sent to President Todd that was in the

PowerPoint presentation and said he wanted senators to be aware of the SC's action. There were no questions or comments.

The Chair then informed senators that the SC had been engaging in discussion regarding the clinical title series (CTS) over the past few months. He said that then-Provost Nietzel charged then-Associate Provost for Academic Affairs Dave Watt with developing recommendations to improve the CTS. Eight recommendations were originally made, but recently the suggestion to offer sabbatical to CTS faculty was withdrawn. He suggested that senators who wished to see the full text of the eight recommendations visit the SC's agenda website for February 5, where the document was available.

Among the major concerns of SC members were: 1. the 25% cap has been surpassed in some colleges; 2. some CTS faculty did not have clinic patients or clients; and 3. some CTS faculty salaries were supported through general fund dollars. The Chair said that the SC met with deans and deans' representatives from the colleges with CTS faculty. The Chair said that Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Heidi Anderson would continue to be involved in ongoing SC discussions.

In response to Cibull, the Chair explained that SC members requested an announcement be made so that senators would not perceive that discussions were ongoing for a long period of time without being informed. He said final discussions would definitely be brought before the full Senate.

Regarding upcoming elections, the Chair said that an election for a faculty trustee would be held in April. The election process would include one ballot if fewer than three nominees were on the ballot. If there were more than three, the top three vote-getters would move to the final round, in which voters would choose a first choice and have the option of identifying a second choice. The process would take place during April, so as not to interfere with end-of-semester activities.

With respect to college elections, the Chair said that the apportionment exercise was underway so colleges could conduct and finish their elections by the end of April.

The Chair noted that according to *Senate Rules*, senators must receive an agenda six days in advance. Agenda item number four ("Proposed New Policy: Automatic Delay of Probationary Periods") was not quite ready for review, and the proposed agenda item number seven ("Proposed Changes to *Senate Rules* 5.1.8.5.A.2 ("Two-Year Window")") was mistakenly not included. He noted that a motion was needed to enact the removal of and addition of agenda items.

Grossman **moved** to amend the agenda to remove number four and add number seven. Sheahan **seconded**. There being no discussion, the motion **passed** with a clear majority in favor and one opposed.

2. State of the Libraries Address – Libraries Dean Carol Diedrichs

The Chair reminded senators that in October 2006, the Senate voted to request an annual state of the Libraries address. He invited Libraries Dean Carol Diedrichs to the podium to give her presentation.

After the [presentation](#), Cibull expressed dissatisfaction with the irregular availability of some periodicals and having to wait two years for some journal articles. Dean Deidrichs replied that the Library bought subscriptions that were up to date and also engaged in aggregate buying, in which the publisher controlled embargoes. While the two-year wait to view articles was acceptable in some fields, in other fields the wait rendered the information contained in the article far less useful. She said that the Library requested recurring dollars every year to keep up with inflation merely to avoid having to cancel some subscriptions. Eight to 10% of a six million dollar budget was needed just to maintain existing subscriptions, let alone purchase new ones. The Libraries are part of a consortial arrangement with other institutions across the country to negotiate the best deals possible.

3. Senate's Library Committee Resolution

The Chair invited Randall, chair of the Senate's Library Committee (SLC), to present the SLC's resolution. After doing so, there were a few comments.

Subsequently, a **vote** was taken on the **motion** to support the resolution from the Senate's Library Committee and direct the Office of the Senate Council to send the resolution to President Todd and Provost Subbaswamy. The motion **passed** with a clear majority in favor and two abstaining.

5. Senate Council's Ad Hoc Calendar Committee Proposal (DISCUSSION ONLY - Possible Action Item for April 9 Meeting)

The Chair explained that in January 2005, the Senate Council created an ad hoc Calendar Committee (CC) to review some proposals that were put forth by the Student Government Association (SGA) to alter finals week and the Thanksgiving break. The preliminary proposal from the CC outlined vast changes and was met with deep concern by representatives of various student-related offices on campus. The SC voted to return that proposal to the CC; the chair of the CC, Yanarella, then opted to limit the scope of the proposal to decrease the negative ramifications. The Chair noted that because the proposal was a major proposal, it was before the Senate for discussion only; a vote would not be taken but could be held in a subsequent meeting.

The Chair explained that the proposal would decrease the fall semester's teaching days by two days, to allow for a Fall Break that coincided with the

Thanksgiving holiday. The end of the semester, including exam week, would remain as is. Part of the rationale was that the spring semester already had (depending on the year) either one to two fewer days of instruction than the fall semester. The Chair invited Yanarella to offer additional information.

Yanarella said that the impetus for the discussion came from a previous SC member, over a concern that faculty were cancelling classes on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving and that students were routinely skipping the Wednesday, sometimes the Tuesday, and even the Monday, before Thanksgiving. There were also parental concerns that holding classes on Wednesday meant that students who left campus after classes to go home for Thanksgiving (TG) were often driving late at night. After concerns expressed about the initial proposal, the CC came up with two new options. The one preferred by representatives of various student-related offices at UK was presented to the SC (with another option), and the SC voted to send the preferred option (the current agenda item) to the Senate for discussion.

Sottile said that one of the reasons he was on the CC was his desire to improve the timing at the end of the semester; finishing courses on Friday and beginning final exams on Monday was a difficulty for many students. Sottile said he supported finishing class work on Wednesday and starting finals on Friday, which would give students additional study time. Even though such a change may have been problematic for some student-related, non-academic departments, it deserved consideration. He added that restructuring dead week was also an option.

A lengthy discussion followed. There were a variety of opinions on the proposal, including:

- Teaching days would be lost.
- The proposed week-long TG break would fall too close to the winter holiday break.
- Having the Wednesday before TG off would alleviate concerns about students traveling the night before the TG holiday.
- It was the beginning of a slippery slope – there would always be “a day before” any proposed break.
- Having the semester begin on Wednesday was detrimental to teaching and learning – in the fall, some students skipped the Wednesday – Friday of the first week to expand the Labor Day holiday, which falls on the following Monday.
- The proposal did not address students’ wishes for increased study time between the end of dead week and finals week.
- Academic aspects (teaching days) were being sacrificed for non-academic concerns (pre-semester activities).
- Faculty could make assignments that would be due upon return from the proposed TG break.

- The rationale of symmetry between semesters was not a sufficient rationale – why was there no discussion on adding two days to the spring semester, instead of taking two fall teaching days away.

Towards the end of the discussion, when asked, no senator spoke against having the Wednesday before TG off, in lieu of the October Friday “fall break.” The Chair thanked senators for a good discussion and asked that additional comments be sent to him.

6. Campus Management (SAP) Module Update - Phyllis Nash & Michelle Nordin

The Chair invited Michelle Nordin, lead IRIS employee for the Campus Management module, to offer a presentation.

Guest Nordin thanked the Chair and gave her presentation. During the presentation, she mentioned that a few departments had experienced problems entering grades at mid-term. Grossman stated that his department (Department of Chemistry, or “Chemistry”) had had various problems with entering grades. Nordin said that she had spoken with support personnel in Chemistry and offered to come over and enter the grades. She said the portal team had been in close contact with College of Arts and Sciences employees and were committed to doing everything possible to address and solve issues. Nordin said she could not speak specifically to the problems in Chemistry, but she would make sure someone was onsite in Chemistry when it came time to enter grades at the end of the semester. She asked to be contacted if problem arose again.

There were a variety of questions asked of Nordin. She answered them and reiterated that she hoped individuals would utilize her contact information and call or email her if they were experiencing problems with the Campus Management module.

The Chair said that agenda item number seven would be addressed at the next meeting. Due to the time, the meeting was adjourned at 5:04 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Larry Grabau,
University Senate Secretary

Absences: Absences: Anderson*, Anyaegbunam, Bartilow, Baxter*, Bernard, Bhavsar, Biagi, Blackwell, Bordo*, Brown, Burchett, Burkhart*, Butler, Caudill, Cheng, Chew, Cibulka, Cooper, Coyne*, Deem, Dembo, DeSimone, Desormeaux*, Dwoskin*, El-Ghannam, Finkel*, Ford, Fording, Fox, Frost, Gaetke, Hasselbring, Hoch, Hoffman, Houtz*, Infanger, Jackson, Jasper*, Jones, Karpf, Kim, Kirschling, Lee*, Lester, Lillich, Look, Martin*, McCormick, McKnight*, Michael, Mitchell*, Mobley, Mohney, Moliterno*, Newman, Patwardhan, Pauly, Perman, Petrone*, Piascik, Pulito, Ray, Roberts*, Rothgeb, Sawaya*, Shay, Smart, R. Smith, M.S.

*Denotes an absence explained prior to the meeting.

Smith, Snow*, Staben, Steiner, Steltenkamp, Subbaswamy, Sudharshan, Terrell, Todd, Turner, Vasconez, Vestal, Voss*, G. Williams, Wiseman, Witt, Wyatt.

Invited guests present: Phyllis Nash and Michele Nordin.

Prepared by Sheila Brothers on May 2, 2007.